

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
University of Nebraska	University Enterprise Server Upgrade		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The University of Nebraska operates an IBM S/390 enterprise server to support our primary administrative business applications. The Enterprise Server supports applications including the Student Information System (SIS+) for UN-L and UNO, Enterprise Resource Planning (SAP), and the PSL/Budget (PSL) systems. Tivoli Storage Manager (TSM) uses an Automatic Tape Library for desktop and server backups and restores. Each of these products/services is continuing to grow as new features and end-users are added to these systems.

The current system is an IBM Z800 with two general purpose engines and two Linux engines. The two general purpose engines are used to support the administrative applications. They provide approximately 350 million instructions per second (mips) or 60 million service units (msu's). The system frequently runs at 100% capacity on this processor and there are times when the daily work load is not completed.

The purpose of this project is to add a new enterprise server to increase the number of processor cycles available in order to complete the ever increasing work load from SIS, SAP, and TSM. Along with the new processor, there will be an increase in software licensing costs.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Future	Total
8. Capital Expenditures						
8.1 Hardware	\$ 350,000.00	\$ 325,000.00	\$ 300,000.00	\$ 275,000.00		\$ 1,250,000.00
8.2 Software	\$ 575,000.00	\$ 600,000.00	\$ 625,000.00	\$ 650,000.00		\$ 2,450,000.00
TOTAL COSTS	\$ 925,000.00	\$ 925,000.00	\$ 925,000.00	\$ 925,000.00	\$ -	\$ 3,700,000.00
General Funds	\$ 925,000.00	\$ 925,000.00	\$ 925,000.00	\$ 925,000.00		\$ 3,700,000.00
TOTAL FUNDS	\$ 925,000.00	\$ 925,000.00	\$ 925,000.00	\$ 925,000.00	\$ -	\$ 3,700,000.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	15	13	14.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	23	23	19	21.7	25
V: Technical Impact	19	20	19	19.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	10	9	9.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	10	9	9	9.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	20	19	14	17.7	20
TOTAL				92	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and	- The narrative provides a comprehensive overview of the need for the project to move	- The narrative does not provide any indication of the likely life-cycle of this upgrade. That is,

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #51-01
Page 2 of 2

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Projected Outcomes	forward.	growth is expected but at what rate and how quickly is additional hardware likely to be required?
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- The narrative provides a good overview of the process whereby need was assessed and some of the alternatives.	- The narrative does not provide a very thorough overview of the options that were considered beyond doing nothing. For example, what alternative platforms were considered? - The justification would be strengthened by providing more detail. What types of transactions are impacted, and what are the consequences?
V: Technical Impact	- The narrative provides complete information to support the acquisition of the proposed hardware/software.	- The narrative raises the question of why processor upgrades are available for this model while not being an option for the current hardware.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- The narrative is clear and concise in this section and the proposed timelines are reasonable.	
VII: Risk Assessment	- The listed risks and management of them is clear and reasonable.	
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Costs are broken out and consistent with the scope of the project.	- The timeframe (question 9, Section VI) indicates that the project will be completed by December 2005 (FY06). The budget shows 25% of the costs in FY06 and the balance spread out over the following 3 fiscal years. Are these the most current prices quoted by reputable vendors, and are they subject to much variability?

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS